



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/743,197	12/22/2003	Bruno Aeberhard	2802	4525

7590 10/25/2004

STRIKER, STRIKER & STENBY
103 East Neck Road
Huntington, NY 11743

EXAMINER

DURAND, PAUL R

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3721

DATE MAILED: 10/25/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/743,197

Applicant(s)

AEBERHARD, BRUNO

Examiner

Paul Durand

Art Unit

3721

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 22 December 2003 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 12/02, 8/03.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: ____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

3. The claims are generally narrative and indefinite, failing to conform with current U.S. practice. They appear to be a literal translation into English from a foreign document and are replete with grammatical and idiomatic errors.

In claim 1, the claim appears to be a foreign translation of a claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claim 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sakai et al (US 4,791,833) in view of Bosman et al (US 5,313,125).

In regard to claims 1 and 2, Sakai discloses the invention substantially as claimed including a plurality of housings which include motor 3, gear 1 and bearing 4,

Art Unit: 3721

which houses drive shaft 5, which are couple in series (see Figs. 1,5 and C2,L43-63).

What Sakai does not disclose is the use of a coupling member with a plastic casing and a metal insert. However, Bosman teaches that it is old and well known in the art to provide components 36,30,28,26 and 22, which are mounted in series and member 22 with metal sleeve 72 mounted and embedded onto polymer member 70a for the purpose of decreasing weight (see Figs. 2,7 and C5,L11-28). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have provided the invention of Sakai with the sleeve means as taught by Bosman for the purpose of decreasing weight.

In regard to claim 3, Sakai discloses the invention substantially as claimed except for a holder coupling all the houses. However, Bosman teaches that it is old and well known in the art to provide a holder 24, which couples components 36,30,28,26 and 22 and engages sleeve 72 by attaching to component 26 for the purpose of effectively keeping the components together (see Figs.2,7 and C3,L60-66). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have provided the invention of Sakai with the holding means as taught by Bosman for the purpose of effectively keeping the components together.

6. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sakai et al (US 4,791,833) in view of Miller (US 5,624,000).

Sakai discloses the invention substantially as claimed as applied to claim 1 above including attachment means in the form of screws 6 (see Figs.1 and 5). What Sakai does not disclose is the use of bayonet fixtures to hold the various components

Art Unit: 3721

together. However, Miller teaches that it is old and well known in the art to provide bayonet fixtures to a component for the purpose of mounting components together (see C1, L36-40). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have provided the invention of Sakai with the bayonet fixture means as taught by Miller for the purpose of mounting components together.

Allowable Subject Matter

7. Claims 4,5 and 7-10 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Tsai, Duncan, Pray, Petersen, DeBlasio, Schreiber and Dusign have been cited to show devices having similar structure.


9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Paul Durand whose telephone number is 703-305-4962. The examiner can normally be reached on 0730-1800, Monday - Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rinaldi I Rada can be reached on 703-308-2187. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 3721

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Paul Durand
October 19, 2004



EUGENE KIM
PRIMARY EXAMINER